

S/N 10/573318

In response to the Office Action dated August 10, 2009

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 3. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Drawing Objection

The drawings are objected to for the reasons noted in the Office Action.

Reference symbols "W1" and "W2" have been added to FIG. 2A to identify the portions with a larger sealing width "W1" for the inclined sealing portion and a smaller or normal sealing width "W2" for the side sealing portions.

Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Specification

The specification has been amended at page 10, line 17 to page 11, line 15 to further clarify the sealing width of the sealing portions and to coincide with the reference symbols as added to FIG. 2A. No new matter is added.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomiyoshi et al. (JP 11-108676) and Gomi (JP 2001-48193). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an elongated packaging material for manufacturing a pouch, having side sealing portions where each of the side sealing portions includes an inclined portion for connection to an adjacent cross sealing portion and the inclined portion has a larger sealing width than other portions of the side sealing portion.

Tomiyoshi discloses a side seal with a pair of inclined sealing portions 20a, 22a, 24a, 26a for connection to the cross sealing portion 20b, 22b. However, each of the inclined sealing portions has a smaller sealing width than the other sealing portions,

S/N 10/573318

In response to the Office Action dated August 10, 2009

which is opposite to the features of claim 1. Therefore, Tomiyoshi does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

Gomi does not disclose an inclined portion having a larger sealing width than other portions of the side sealing portion. Therefore, Gomi does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 and the deficiencies of Tomiyoshi are not remedied by Gomi and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1. The rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn. The rejection of claim 3 is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Dated: November 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/lif